

Appl. No. 10/707,439
Amdt. dated March 10, 2005
Reply to Office action of December 28, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. **Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sung (Pub. No.: 2003/0197665):**

5

Sung discloses, as shown in Fig.1 and lines 1-14 of paragraph [0025], a driving circuit and a corresponding driving method, and the method indeed comprises the steps of (a) providing a first metal transistor whose first and second ends are connected to an OLED and to a first voltage source respectively, (b) providing a capacitor whose first end is connected to a gate of the first MOS transistor, (c) providing a second MOS transistor whose first end is utilized for inputting data, a second end of the second MOS transistor being connected to the first end of the capacitor, and (d) turning on the second MOS transistor. However, Sung fails to teach "(e) turning off the second MOS transistor after step (d), and adjusting a voltage at a second end of the capacitor from a first voltage level to a second voltage level different from the first voltage level sequentially", which is recited in claim 1.

10
15

Instead, Sung teaches that a driving current generated by a driving thin film can be modified through an adjustment of a width/length ratio of the driving thin film transistor, so that the luminance of red light emitted from a red LED, the luminance of green light emitted from a green LED, and the luminance of blue light emitted from a blue LED in such a ratio that white light is produced and full coloration is attained (paragraph [0029]). For example, the width/length ratio of $(W/L)_R:(W/L)_G:(W/L)_B$ can be 15:6:5 (paragraph [0028]). However, this does not give any motivation for performing step (e) in claim 1.

20

25

Having the additional step of "(e) turning off the second MOS transistor after

Appl. No. 10/707,439
Amdt. dated March 10, 2005
Reply to Office action of December 28, 2004

step (d), and adjusting a voltage at a second end of the capacitor from a first voltage level to a second voltage level different from the first voltage level sequentially", the present invention according to claim 1 excludes the possibility of charge accumulation and stabilizes the threshold voltage V_{th} .

5

Since Sung does not teach or suggest all limitations contained in claim 1, Sung does not anticipate claim 1 of the present invention.

10

Claims 8, 9, and 11 are cancelled without prejudice and are no longer in need of consideration. Claims 2-5 and 7 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-5 and 7 is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sung (Pub. No.: 2003/0197665):

15

Claim 10 is cancelled, and is therefore no longer in need of consideration. Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 6 is requested.

3. Introduction to new claims 12-17:

20

25

Claim 12 is drafted based on the original claim 1. In addition, claim 12 contains limitations that specify the sequence in which the voltage at the second end of the capacitor is controlled with respect to turning off the second MOS transistor. That is, steps (e) to (h) of claim 12 recite that the second end of the first capacitor is set to a first level, followed by turning off the second MOS transistor. Next, the voltage at the second end of the capacitor is adjusted to a second level for discharging the capacitor followed by adjusting the voltage back to the first level. These limitations are fully supported by paragraph 0028 of the specification and by Fig.4. No new matter is added.

Appl. No. 10/707,439
Amdt. dated March 10, 2005
Reply to Office action of December 28, 2004

On the other hand, Sung does not teach turning off the second transistor, adjusting the voltage at the second end of the capacitor from a first level to a second level, or returning the voltage at the second end of the capacitor from the second voltage level to the first voltage level. Therefore, claim 12 is patentably distinct from Sung.

Claims 13-17 are duplicates of claims 2-3 and 5-7, respectively, and no new matter has been added through any of these claims. Furthermore, claims 13-17 are dependent on claim 12 and should be allowed if claim 12 is allowed. Acceptance of new claims 12-17 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

15 Winston Hsu

Date: March 10, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

20 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan).